Lemons in the Timeline: Information Asymmetry and Adverse Selection in Social-Media Financial Domination (Findom)

Le bâtard de Voltaire

Abstract

Akerlof's classic "market for lemons" result shows how quality uncertainty and asymmetric information can induce adverse selection: when buyers cannot reliably distinguish high-quality from low-quality offerings, they rationally discount prices, which can drive high-quality sellers from the market and leave a pool of "lemons" (Akerlof 1970). This paper applies that logic to the contemporary market for social-media mediated financial domination ("findom"), a niche form of cybermediated erotic labor in which money or gifts are exchanged for a domination dynamic (McCracken and Brooks-Gordon 2021). We argue that findom intensifies the lemons problem because it is an experience good (Nelson 1970), often involves strong privacy constraints and account pseudonymity, and is transacted through platform affordances (DMs, tributes, wishlists) that frequently require payment before meaningful verification (Chester 2023). We formalize a minimal adverse-selection mechanism and then discuss how signaling, reputation, and platform design can partially repair market failure while respecting consent and privacy.

1 Introduction

Financial domination (findom) is typically described as an online-mediated kink or paid service in which a submissive participant transfers money or gifts to a dominant participant in exchange for a domination dynamic that may be sexual, psychological, or both (McCracken and Brooks-Gordon 2021). While the practice predates mainstream social media, digital platforms lower search costs and enable rapid identity construction and monetization, placing findom within broader transformations of sex work and intimacy online (Durkin 2007; McCracken and Brooks-Gordon 2021).

Empirical academic work on findom remains limited, though it is growing. Durkin (2007) documented an early online form of "money slavery" and emphasized the opportunities for fraud in anonymous internet-mediated exchanges. McCracken and Brooks-Gordon (2021) use survey and netnographic methods to analyze how findomme interactions unfold across communication modalities (text, voice, video), and argue that findom exists on a continuum from BDSM microculture practice to more explicitly commercial labor. More recently, Gunduz et al. (2024) analyze social-media discourse and network structure around findom-themed interactions on Twitter/X, illustrating how the practice is framed and coordinated in a platform setting.

Alongside scholarly work, journalistic reporting highlights a persistent practical issue: scamming and catfishing. For example, Chester (2023) reports that some clients are asked to pay before any interaction, which prevents ex ante assessment of authenticity and increases the risk of fraud, while providers may hesitate to offer real-time verification because even a verification clip can be treated as uncompensated sexual content. Platform governance also shapes the environment: on X, adult content is permitted only under labeling and placement constraints, and policies restrict highly

visible display and emphasize enforcement against impersonation and deceptive identities (X Corp. 2024; X Corp. 2026). Together, these features suggest a natural fit for Akerlof-style analysis.

This paper contributes a compact, theory-driven account of why social-media findom can exhibit "lemons" dynamics and what kinds of institutions might mitigate them. The goal is explanatory rather than normative: we analyze market structure, not the desirability of the practice.

2 Background: Information Problems, Signaling, and Platforms

The lemons framework is one corner of a larger literature on information and market performance. Three strands matter here.

First, the distinction between *search* and *experience* goods clarifies why some markets are especially vulnerable to quality uncertainty. For experience goods, quality is difficult to evaluate prior to purchase, creating incentives for opportunism and increasing the value of trustworthy intermediaries and reputations (Nelson 1970). Findom interactions are quintessentially experience-based: participants often learn "fit" and reliability only through interaction over time (McCracken and Brooks-Gordon 2021).

Second, the economics of *signaling* examines how high-quality agents can credibly separate themselves from low-quality types through costly or hard-to-fake signals (Spence 1973). In online settings, reputation mechanisms can implement such signaling at scale. Experimental evidence from eBay shows that reputation measurably affects willingness-to-pay, and that "new identity" status is economically penalized (Resnick et al. 2006). These results are directly relevant to social-media markets where identity persistence is fragile and where follower counts or tenure are often treated as credibility signals (Chester 2023).

Third, findom is mediated by platforms that behave like two-sided markets: they bring together creators and consumers (or providers and clients), set rules, and shape price allocation and participation through design and governance (Rochet and Tirole 2003; Armstrong 2006). Platform rules about content labeling, visibility, impersonation, and enforcement affect both *the cost of participating* and *the feasibility of credible signaling*.

3 Akerlof's "Market for Lemons" Model

3.1 Core mechanism

In Akerlof (1970), sellers observe the quality of the good, while buyers observe only the distribution of quality. The central insight is that when buyers cannot condition their willingness-to-pay on true quality, the price they are willing to offer reflects expected quality of the goods that *actually come to market*. But which goods come to market depends on the price, because high-quality sellers may refuse to sell at a price that does not compensate them for the quality they possess. This feedback loop induces adverse selection.

A simple stylized version captures the logic. Let quality be $q \in [0, 1]$. A seller with quality q has reservation value $r(q) = q$ (higher quality is more valuable to keep), while buyers value the item at $v(q) = \alpha q$ with $\alpha > 1$. Sellers observe q; buyers do not.

Suppose buyers offer a single price p based on expected quality among items offered for sale. Sellers sell iff $r(q) \leq p$, i.e. $q \leq p$. If quality is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$, the average quality conditional on sale is

$$\mathbb{E}[q \mid q \leq p] = \frac{p}{2}.$$

A competitive buyer's maximum willingness-to-pay equals expected value:

$$p = \alpha\,\mathbb{E}[q \mid q \le p] = \alpha\frac{p}{2}.$$

This implies either $p = 0$ or $\alpha = 2$. For $\alpha < 2$, the only equilibrium is $p = 0$ and the market collapses in this stylized case: trade that would be mutually beneficial under full information does not occur because the informational environment prevents price from tracking quality.

The specific functional forms are not the point. The robust conclusion is: *quality uncertainty can drive a wedge between private and social returns, pushing high-quality offerings out of the market and degrading the average quality of what remains* (Akerlof 1970).

3.2 Repair: signaling and reputation

Akerlof's analysis implies a menu of institutional "repairs" that increase observability of quality (warranties, certification, credible third parties), or that penalize low-quality behavior (legal remedies, enforceable contracts), or that allow high-quality sellers to separate themselves via costly signals (Akerlof 1970; Spence 1973). In online markets, reputation systems often play the role of decentralized certification, with measurable economic impact (Resnick et al. 2006).

4 Applying Lemons to Social-Media Findom

4.1 What is being traded? An experience good under privacy constraints

In findom, the "product" is not a durable object but an interactional bundle: attention, role-play, affective labor, and a domination dynamic that may be framed as a kink practice, a paid service, or both (McCracken and Brooks-Gordon 2021). That makes quality hard to assess ex ante in the sense of Nelson (1970): the participant often discovers value only after paying and interacting.

At the same time, privacy and stigma (for both providers and clients) create structural limits on transparency. Many participants use pseudonyms; some avoid face verification; and accounts may be transient. These are not merely strategic deceptions but often rational safety practices. Unfortunately, they also increase the feasible set of scams.

4.2 The information asymmetry: authentic providers vs. lemons

Akerlof's "quality" variable maps naturally onto attributes that matter to the buyer (the paying submissive) but are difficult to verify before payment:

- **Authenticity**: Is this a real person consistent with their presented identity?
- **Reliability**: Will the provider actually engage as implied, or disappear after payment?
- **Skill and fit**: Is the interaction well-matched to the client's preferences?
- **Consent and boundary adherence**: Does the provider respect negotiated limits and privacy?

These are largely unobservable prior to interaction, and social media provides low-cost identity creation. Reporting emphasizes that catfishing and scamming can be performed anonymously with low barriers to entry, and that requiring payment before interaction prevents clients from assessing genuineness (Chester 2023). Early academic discussion of online money masochism similarly noted ample opportunities for fraud in anonymous internet contexts (Durkin 2007).

4.3 A minimal adverse-selection model for findom

Consider a stylized one-shot interaction. A provider (domme) is one of two types:

- High quality H (authentic, boundary-aware, reliable), delivering value $V_H > 0$ to the client at cost $C_H > 0$ (time, emotional labor, reputational risk).
- Low quality L (low effort or fraudulent), delivering value $V_L \leq 0$ at cost $C_L \approx 0$.

A client cannot observe type, but believes the probability of H is $\theta \in [0, 1]$. The provider demands an up-front payment (tribute) t before interaction, a pattern explicitly described in accounts of the space (Chester 2023).

The client's expected utility from paying is

$$U(t) = \theta V_H + (1 - \theta)V_L - t.$$

A rational client participates only if $U(t) \geq 0$, i.e.

$$t \leq \theta V_H + (1 - \theta)V_L.$$

A high-quality provider participates if $t \geq C_H$; a low-quality provider participates if $t \geq C_L$.

Trade with high-quality providers is feasible only if

$$C_H \leq \theta V_H + (1 - \theta)V_L.$$

This inequality shows the Akerlof logic in one line: when the perceived share of authentic providers θ declines (e.g. due to visible scam prevalence), the maximum tribute a client will rationally pay drops. Once it falls below the cost of providing high-quality service, authentic providers exit or migrate (e.g. to gated communities), leaving a higher proportion of low-quality types. That further reduces θ, reinforcing the spiral.

Importantly, this does not require clients to be naive. It is precisely *rational skepticism*—in the face of unverifiable quality—that produces the low-price equilibrium.

4.4 A "double lemons" problem: adverse selection on both sides

Findom also exhibits two-sided uncertainty. Providers face their own hidden-type problem about clients: some may be genuine long-run participants, while others may be time-wasters, abusive, or otherwise costly to engage. Reporting suggests that provider reluctance to verify identity via free "verification videos" can be rationalized by the possibility that even verification is treated as uncompensated sexual content (Chester 2023). In response, providers may demand up-front payment as a screening device—but that very mechanism increases the client's ex ante risk.

This mutual suspicion resembles a two-sided market with adverse selection on both sides, mediated by platform rules and affordances (Rochet and Tirole 2003; Armstrong 2006). The result can be a coordination failure: each side adopts protective strategies that, in aggregate, reduce mutually beneficial trade.

4.5 Platform governance as a constraint on signaling

Platform rules shape what can be signaled and how stable reputation can be. On X, adult content is permitted only with labeling and not in highly visible areas; unmarked or improperly placed content can be restricted or removed (X Corp. 2024). The platform also prohibits misleading and deceptive

identities and other authenticity violations (X Corp. 2026). Even when such rules are aligned with safety, their enforcement and visibility constraints can reduce the channels through which providers establish stable, reputation-bearing identities, and can raise the effective depreciation rate of reputational capital (e.g. when accounts are restricted or suspended).

The lemons implication is subtle but important: when identity persistence is fragile, *reputation becomes harder to accumulate*, increasing the relative competitiveness of low-cost, disposable scam identities.

5 Repairing the Market: Signaling, Screening, and Institutional Design

Akerlof's analysis suggests that market outcomes improve when quality becomes more observable or when deception becomes more costly (Akerlof 1970). In findom, repairs must respect privacy and consent norms while discouraging fraud.

5.1 Costly signals and credible commitments

Following signaling logic (Spence 1973), high-quality providers can adopt signals that are costly for scammers to mimic:

- **Identity persistence**: long-lived accounts with consistent posting and interaction history.
- **Reputation-bearing ties**: durable relationships, repeat clients, and credible third-party vouching.
- **Cross-platform consistency**: presence across platforms that increases the cost of rebuilding after exposure.

However, cheap signals (purchased followers, stolen images) are easily imitated, which limits their separating power.

5.2 Reputation systems and feedback

Reputation mechanisms can be effective when they are hard to game and when identities persist. The eBay field experiment evidence shows that reputation measurably raises willingness-to-pay, implying that reputation can counteract lemons dynamics in online exchange (Resnick et al. 2006). Translating that lesson, findom-adjacent ecosystems that support identity persistence and credible feedback (while protecting privacy) should reduce adverse selection.

5.3 Staged exchange and escrow-like structures

One classical fix for experience-good markets is to reduce up-front exposure by staging payments or allowing partial "sampling" before full payment (Nelson 1970). In findom, such structures may conflict with some participants' preferred dynamics (e.g. the symbolism of tribute), but the economic logic remains: separating a small, low-stakes initial interaction from larger transfers can reduce fraud incentives and allow learning. And, indeed, we observe that the findom market has largely converged to the demand of a modest "initial tribute to speak" fee.The challenge is that this market repair must not be reinterpreted by participants as "cheap content" extraction, which would reintroduce provider-side lemons.

5.4 Platform design levers

Two-sided market theory emphasizes that platforms can affect participation and quality through rule design and price allocation (Rochet and Tirole 2003; Armstrong 2006). In principle, platforms can reduce lemons dynamics by:

- strengthening anti-impersonation enforcement (X Corp. 2026),
- offering optional verification features that preserve pseudonymity while increasing proof-of-personhood,
- improving friction and reporting pathways for fraud and coercion (X Corp. 2024),
- supporting reputation portability or longevity to reduce the "reset" advantage of scammers.

These interventions are not costless: stronger verification can exclude legitimate privacy-seeking participants, and aggressive enforcement can produce false positives that destroy reputational capital. The lemons lens helps articulate the trade-off: policies that unintentionally make high-quality participation more expensive can worsen adverse selection.

6 Conclusion

Social-media findom exhibits the structural conditions that make Akerlof's lemons dynamics plausible: quality is hard to observe before payment, identities can be cheap to create and discard, and privacy constraints impede straightforward verification (Akerlof 1970; Nelson 1970; Chester 2023). A minimal adverse-selection model predicts that increased scam prevalence rationally depresses willingness-to-pay, which can drive authentic providers away from open platforms and leave a lower-quality public-facing market.

The same environment creates a two-sided version of the problem: providers face hidden-type risks from clients, prompting screening strategies (up-front tributes) that further increase client-side risk (Chester 2023). Market repair is therefore not just about "catching scammers," but about designing credible signals, reputations, and platform institutions that allow trust to form without sacrificing privacy and consent (Spence 1973; Resnick et al. 2006; Rochet and Tirole 2003).

References

Akerlof, George A. (1970). "The Market for "Lemons": Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism". In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84.3, pp. 488–500. DOI: 10.2307/1879431.

Armstrong, Mark (2006). "Competition in Two-Sided Markets". In: *The RAND Journal of Economics* 37.3, pp. 668–691. DOI: 10.1111/j.1756-2171.2006.tb00037.x.

Chester, Nick (Feb. 21, 2023). *Financial Domination Has a Scamming Problem*. VICE. URL: https://www.vice.com/en/article/financial-domination-has-a-scamming-problem/ (visited on 01/16/2026).

Durkin, Keith F. (2007). "Show Me the Money: Cybershrews and on-line Money Masochists". In: *Deviant Behavior* 28.4, pp. 355–378. DOI: 10.1080/01639620701233290.

Gunduz, Ugur, Sadettin Demirel, and Isil Tombul (2024). "Exploring the Concept of Financial Domination on Social Media: Sentiment and Text Analysis on Twitter". In: *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 32.4. Published online 21 Feb 2023., pp. 602–625. DOI: 10.1080/15456870.2023.2178000.

McCracken, Rosey and Belinda Brooks-Gordon (2021). "Findommes, Cybermediated Sex Work, and Rinsing". In: *Sex Research and Social Policy* 18.4, pp. 837–854. DOI: 10.1007/s13178-021-00609-3.

Nelson, Phillip (1970). "Information and Consumer Behavior". In: *Journal of Political Economy* 78.2, pp. 311–329. DOI: 10.1086/259630.

Resnick, Paul, Richard Zeckhauser, John Swanson, and Kate Lockwood (2006). "The Value of Reputation on eBay: A Controlled Experiment". In: *Experimental Economics* 9, pp. 79–101. DOI: 10.1007/s10683-006-4309-2.

Rochet, Jean-Charles and Jean Tirole (2003). "Platform Competition in Two-Sided Markets". In: *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1.4, pp. 990–1029. DOI: 10.1162/154247603322493212.

Spence, Michael (1973). "Job Market Signaling". In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87.3, pp. 355–374. DOI: 10.2307/1882010.

X Corp. (May 2024). *Adult Content Policy*. Help Center policy page ("May 2024"). URL: https://help.x.com/en/rules-and-policies/adult-content (visited on 01/16/2026).

— (2026). *The X Rules: Safety, Privacy, Authenticity, and More*. Help Center policy overview page. URL: https://help.x.com/en/rules-and-policies/x-rules (visited on 01/16/2026).